

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the foregoing comments, is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-51 are pending in the application. Claims 21, 35, 37 and 51 are amended by the present amendment. Support for the amended claims can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings.¹ No new matter is presented.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 21-24, 28-38 and 40-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,469,373 to Kashiwazaki et al. (hereinafter Kashiwazaki) in view of “Jandel Scientific Announces Java (R) 1.4”, News Release, Corte Madera, CA, March 1, 1991 by Osborn; and Claims 25 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kashiwazaki and Osborn, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,455,599 to Cabral et al. (hereinafter Cabral).

The undersigned appreciatively acknowledges the courtesy extended by Examiner Garcia in holding a personal interview with the undersigned on October 15, 2007. During the interview, an overview of the invention was presented, and proposed claim amendments were discussed in light of the applied references. No agreement was reached during the interview pending the formal submission of a response to the outstanding Office Action.

The Official Action rejected Claims 21-24, 26-38 and 40-51 as unpatentable over Kashiwazaki in view of Osborn. The Official Action cites Kashiwazaki as disclosing Applicant’s invention with the exception of controlling the printer, or reporting printer status “using an object oriented command.” The Official Action cites Osborn as disclosing this claimed feature, and states that it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to arrive at Applicant’s claims. In response to this rejection,

¹ E.g. specification, Figs. 3-6 and pp. 14-17.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claims 21, 35 and 51 recite novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Independent Claim 21 recites, a printer, comprising:

a communication interface;
an image forming device; and
a processor, connected to the communication interface
and the image forming device, configured to report a printer
status using an object oriented command,
*wherein the printer status includes printer
configuration information.*

Independent Claims 35 and 51, while directed to alternative embodiments, recite substantially similar features. Accordingly, the remarks presented below are applicable to each of independent Claims 21, 35 and 51.

As noted above, the Official Action relies on p. 1 of Osborn as disclosing the feature of controlling the printer or reporting a printer status using an object oriented command.

Osborn is a press release document describing the release of JAVA 1.4, described as a “major update to JAVA video analysis software for IBM PC’s and compatibles.”

Osborn, however, fails to teach or suggest implementing the software package on anything other than a PC and other compatible computers, and fails to teach or suggest the use of the software on a printer to perform printing operations, as claimed. Instead, Osborn merely describes that “new features in Java 1.4 include image arithmetic, image snapshots, image bit form transforms... and printing.” Osborn, however, fails to teach or suggest using Java for reporting a printer status, as recited in amended independent Claim 21. Instead, Osborn appears to indicate that Java can be used for formatting an image for a printing operation, not for controlling the printer or reporting a printer status. Therefore, Osborn fails to teach or suggest reporting a printer status using an object oriented command *wherein the printer status includes printer configuration information*, as recited in amended independent Claim 21.

Further, as admitted in the outstanding Official Action, Kashiwazaki fails to disclose “to control the printer or to report a printer status using an object oriented command.” Also, as depicted, in Figs. 1 and 5, for example, Kashiwazaki fails to teach or suggest that any information is transmitted from the printer control unit 1 to the “external device” 2, whatsoever.

Therefore, Osborn and Kashiwazaki, neither alone, nor in combination, teach or suggest reporting a printer status using an object oriented command *wherein the printer status includes printer configuration information*, as recited in amended independent Claim 21.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 21, 35 and 51, and the claims the depend therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 25 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kashiwazaki and Osborn, in further view Cabral. As noted above, Kashiwazaki and Osborn, neither alone, nor in combination, teach or suggest controlling a printer or reporting a printer status using an object oriented command. Likewise, Cabral fails to remedy this deficiency, and therefore, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest Claims 25 and 39, which include the above distinguished limitation by virtue of dependency.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 25 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/684,429
Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2007

Consequently, in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 21-51 is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable consideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\24's\243747-US\243747US - -AM DUE 092107.DOC